E-ISSN: 3031-8629
P-ISSN: 3032-325
Halaman 238-256
Volume 2 Nomor 1 Tahun 2025

Community Language Learning and Cognitive Engagement in an English Debate Community

Firmansyah[1], Dira Permana[2], Baiq Zuhrotun Nafisah[3]
[1,2,3]English Language Education Department, FBMB, Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika
Jl. Pemuda No. 59 A, Mataram, Indonesia 83125
E-Mail: firmans0413@gmail.com

Abstrak

Penelitian ini mengkaji bagaimana prinsip Community Language Learning muncul dalam kegiatan Executive English Debate Community Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika dan bagaimana lingkungan tersebut berkaitan dengan keterlibatan kognitif anggota. Studi kasus kualitatif menggunakan wawancara semi-terstruktur, observasi pada empat pertemuan debat, dan naskah pidato peserta sebagai sumber data yang saling melengkapi. Sumber penelitian mengidentifikasi keamanan emosional, kepercayaan diri dan motivasi, pengembangan argumen secara kolaboratif, serta kesempatan untuk berpikir kritis, memecahkan masalah, dan berkomunikasi. Tantangan utama yang terdokumentasi ialah partisipasi yang tidak merata dan kebutuhan fasilitasi yang lebih terstruktur. Artikel ini menafsirkan temuan sebagai praktik dan pengalaman yang terikat konteks, bukan peningkatan kompetensi kognitif yang diukur secara eksperimental. Pembahasan memperdalam hubungan antara dukungan interpersonal, keberanian mengajukan argumen yang belum sempurna, evaluasi bukti, respons terhadap sanggahan, serta revisi posisi. Naskah pidato digunakan untuk melengkapi laporan kepercayaan diri dengan bukti tekstual tentang organisasi argumen. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa prinsip CLL dapat mendukung lingkungan debat produktif ketika bantuan, tanggung jawab, dan umpan balik didistribusikan secara sengaja. Penelitian lanjutan perlu mengikuti perkembangan individu pada mosi baru dan mendokumentasikan perubahan argumen secara lebih transparan.
Kata kunci: Community Language Learning; debate; cognitive engagement; critical thinking; qualitative case study

Abstract

This study examined how Community Language Learning principles appeared in the Executive English Debate Community at Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika and how the environment

related to members' cognitive engagement. The qualitative case study drew on semi-structured interviews, observations across four debate meetings, and participants' written speeches as complementary evidence. The source identified emotional safety, confidence and motivation, collaborative argument development, and opportunities for critical thinking, problem-solving, and communication. It also documented unequal participation and a need for more structured facilitation. The present article interprets these findings as context-bound practices and experiences rather than experimentally measured gains in cognitive competence. The discussion deepens the relationship among interpersonal support, willingness to propose unfinished arguments, evaluation of evidence, responses to counterclaims, and revision of positions. Written speeches complement confidence reports by providing textual evidence about argument organization. The findings suggest that CLL principles can support a productive debate environment when assistance, responsibility, and feedback are deliberately distributed. Further research should follow individual development across unfamiliar motions and document changes in argument quality more transparently.
Keywords: Community Language Learning; debate; cognitive engagement; critical thinking; qualitative case study

INTRODUCTION

Debate places language learners in a setting where linguistic performance and reasoning occur at the same time. Participants must interpret a motion, select a position, organize supporting reasons, respond to objections, and make their message intelligible to listeners. These demands create opportunities for cognitive engagement, but participation in debate does not automatically demonstrate growth in critical thinking or problem-solving. A persuasive delivery may contain weak evidence, while a hesitant contribution may identify an important logical limitation. An empirical account therefore needs to distinguish what members report, what is observed in interaction, and what their written arguments actually show.

Community Language Learning (CLL) was originally developed as a humanistic approach that treats learners as whole persons and emphasizes a supportive counselor-client relationship, gradual independence, and the reduction of threat in language use (Curran, 1976; La Forge, 1983). In canonical descriptions, the teacher or counselor helps

learners express intended meanings while responsibility gradually shifts toward the group and individual learners (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). The debate community examined in the source study should not be assumed to reproduce every classical CLL procedure. Rather, the study uses CLL as a lens for understanding supportive interaction, peer assistance, emotional security, and increasing responsibility within a naturally occurring debate environment.

This distinction matters because emotional safety and intellectual challenge are not opposite instructional goals. A participant who expects ridicule may avoid offering an incomplete argument, reducing opportunities for feedback and revision. A respectful community can lower the interpersonal cost of participation while preserving demanding questions about evidence and reasoning. Vygotskian perspectives on socially mediated learning and research on exploratory dialogue similarly suggest that cognition can be developed through interaction when participants are required to explain, justify, and reconsider ideas rather than simply agree with one another (Vygotsky, 1978; Mercer & Littleton, 2007).

Cognitive engagement in debate is most visible when participants do something with reasons and evidence. Toulmin's argument model highlights the relation among claims, data, warrants, qualifications, and rebuttals, offering a practical vocabulary for examining whether a position is merely stated or actually supported (Toulmin, 2003). In a language-learning community, these elements can also reveal where linguistic limitations interfere with reasoning. A participant may understand a counterargument but lack the expressions needed to qualify a claim or connect evidence to a conclusion. The analysis should therefore separate difficulty in English expression from weakness in reasoning whenever the available data allow that distinction.

The social distribution of participation is equally important. Cooperative work can expand opportunities for explanation and peer support, but a small number of confident members can also dominate discussion and leave others with limited cognitive responsibility (Gillies, 2016). Engagement research further distinguishes behavioral participation from emotional and cognitive investment, cautioning against treating

visible activity as a complete measure of learning (Fredricks et al., 2004). In debate, the number of speaking turns is therefore informative but insufficient. The quality of a claim, the use of evidence, responsiveness to challenge, and willingness to revise a position provide more direct indications of intellectually productive participation.

UNDIKMA scholarship provides a particularly relevant local context for these issues. Muliani and Sumarsono (2021) examined intercultural communicative competence in a debating class and involved members of the Executive English Debate Community in constructing activities, reporting active idea exchange, peer collaboration, and problem-solving opportunities. Permana, Suadiyatno, and Harmawati (2019) showed that structured peer work can be linked with critical-thinking demands, while Hidayatullah and Qomariyah (2023) reported improvement in critical thinking through a strategy that required learners to take and defend positions in speaking and writing. These studies support examining debate as a site where participation structure and cognitive demand interact, but they do not predetermine the findings of the present qualitative case.

Other UNDIKMA studies clarify the affective conditions surrounding oral participation. Milanrianto, Permana, and Ariani (2023) identified preparation, rehearsal, cooperation, self-talk, and relaxation among strategies learners used to manage speaking anxiety. Suadiyatno, Firman, Hanan, and Sumarsono (2020) likewise found that anxiety was related to speaking outcomes in a contextual teaching setting, while Setianingsih, Nafisah, Sumarni, and Kamarudin (2024) reported a strong relationship between self-efficacy and speaking performance. These findings make confidence and emotional safety educationally relevant, yet they also reinforce the need to keep self-reported belief separate from demonstrated argument quality.

Local work on active and critical learning extends the comparison beyond speaking. Prayati, Haerazi, Irawan, and Vikasari (2020) connected culture-based English materials with critical thinking and classroom interaction; Haerazi, Utama, and Hidayatullah (2020) linked mobile-supported writing with critical thinking among pre-service teachers; and Hanan, Terasne, and Permana (2024) developed task-based

extensive-reading materials requiring evaluation, comparison, and synthesis. Although these studies use different skills and designs, they share a principle relevant to debate: cognitive outcomes become more defensible when tasks require observable reasoning rather than when engagement is inferred from activity alone.

The source study focused on members of the Executive English Debate Community at Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika. It used interviews, observations across four debate meetings, and participants' written speeches to examine emotional safety, confidence and motivation, collaborative argument construction, critical thinking, problem-solving, communication, and participation challenges. The present article retains that qualitative scope. It asks how CLL-oriented support was experienced and enacted, what cognitive practices can be identified in the documented debate activity, and which constraints qualify the positive interpretation. The contribution is therefore a context-sensitive account of a debate community rather than an experimental comparison of CLL with another teaching method.

METHOD

The source research employed a qualitative case-study design in the Executive English Debate Community at Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika. The case was defined by the community, its debate activities, and the period of data collection documented in the thesis. Data were obtained through semi-structured interviews, observations across four debate meetings, and participants' written speeches. These sources represented three different evidential perspectives: members' accounts of their experience, situated interaction during debate, and textual products that preserved selected features of argument construction. A case-study design is appropriate for examining such a bounded social setting when context is integral to the phenomenon being interpreted (Yin, 2018).

The source analysis followed an interactive qualitative process involving data condensation, display, and conclusion drawing. The present article reorganized the documented findings around emotional safety, confidence and motivation, collaborative

argument development, cognitive engagement, communication, and participation constraints. Interviews were treated as evidence of participants' perspectives, observations as evidence of interactional practices during the four documented meetings, and written speeches as evidence of how selected arguments were organized. This distinction follows the principle that qualitative sources can complement one another without becoming interchangeable measures (Miles, Huberman, & Saldana, 2014).

Triangulation was interpreted as comparison across sources rather than automatic confirmation. A participant could report increased confidence while a written speech still showed limited support for a claim, or an observation could reveal unequal participation despite positive accounts of community support. Such divergence is analytically useful because it identifies where perceived experience and documented performance do not fully coincide. The thematic interpretation therefore retained both convergence and tension, consistent with reflexive qualitative analysis that treats coding as an interpretive process rather than a mechanical route to one undisputed truth (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2019).

The manuscript did not create a pretest-posttest score for cognitive competence, infer statistical improvement from interview themes, or claim superiority over another instructional approach. Personal identifiers were excluded, and no new interview, observation, ethical approval identifier, or validation procedure was introduced. Authorship and correspondence followed the supplied source. Recommendations concerning argument rubrics, role rotation, unfamiliar motions, and longer observation are presented as future directions rather than procedures retrospectively attributed to the original case.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The source identifies emotional safety and a nonjudgmental learning environment as important features of members' experience. Participants associated the community with greater confidence and motivation to contribute to debate. The same account

describes collaborative development of arguments, opportunities for critical thinking, problem-solving, and communication, as well as a persistent challenge of unequal participation. These themes provide a coherent picture of a supportive but intellectually demanding community. They should nevertheless be interpreted as situated qualitative findings rather than as standardized gains in cognition or language proficiency.

The three evidence sources contribute differently to that interpretation. Interviews make members' perceptions and retrospective explanations visible; observations document selected interactional practices across four meetings; and written speeches preserve particular argumentative products. Table 1 summarizes these sources and the boundary of the claim each can support. The distinction is important because confidence, participation, and argument quality are related but not interchangeable outcomes.

Table 1. Evidence sources and interpretive boundaries in the debate-community study

Theme / source	Evidence documented in the source	Interpretive boundary
Emotional safety; interviews and observations	Members described a supportive, nonjudgmental environment and willingness to participate.	Supports an account of perceived and observed participation conditions, not a standardized reduction in anxiety.
Confidence and motivation; interviews	Participants associated community activity with greater confidence and motivation.	Self-reported experience should not be treated as an independently measured change in speaking or cognition.

Theme / source	Evidence documented in the source	Interpretive boundary
Argument development; observations and written speeches	Members exchanged ideas, organized positions, and developed arguments collaboratively.	Shows situated argument practices; it does not establish uniform improvement for every member.
Critical thinking and problem-solving; cross-source interpretation	Debate created opportunities to justify claims, respond to viewpoints, and solve argumentative problems.	Indicates cognitive engagement within documented tasks, not a validated general cognitive-competence score.
Participation challenge; observations	Contribution was not equally distributed and structured facilitation was needed.	Unequal access to speaking and reasoning opportunities qualifies any group-level improvement claim.

Emotional safety is pedagogically important because debate exposes a speaker's ideas to public evaluation. A participant who expects ridicule or personal attack may avoid proposing a tentative claim, which also removes an opportunity for peers to examine and improve the reasoning. CLL's humanistic orientation is relevant here: support can make an incomplete idea speakable without making the idea immune from critique (Curran, 1976; La Forge, 1983). The source's positive accounts are therefore most persuasive when safety is understood as a condition for intellectual risk-taking rather than as the absence of disagreement.

At the same time, the debate community should not be described as a full implementation of classical CLL unless the source documents its canonical procedures. Richards and Rodgers (2014) describe CLL as involving distinctive counselor-learner relationships, learner-generated messages, and a gradual shift toward independence.

The source case appears to draw most clearly on the supportive and collaborative principles of the approach. Calling this a CLL-informed debate environment is analytically stronger than assuming that every community activity constitutes the method in its complete historical form. This clarification also improves transferability because readers can identify which principles, rather than which label, matter in their own setting.

The source's accounts of confidence and motivation should similarly remain distinct from performance evidence. Confidence can increase the probability that a learner attempts a speaking turn, asks for clarification, or continues after difficulty. It cannot show whether the claim is well supported. MacIntyre, Clement, Dornyei, and Noels (1998) conceptualize willingness to communicate as situational and influenced by confidence, while Setianingsih et al. (2024) demonstrate that self-efficacy can be strongly related to speaking performance. These relationships justify attention to belief, but they do not make self-report a substitute for direct analysis of argument quality.

Milanrianto et al. (2023) are especially relevant to the source because they identify cooperation, preparation, and rehearsal as strategies used by Indonesian EFL learners to manage speaking anxiety. A debate community can provide all three: members can prepare positions together, rehearse difficult ideas, and rely on peers for clarification. The educational value, however, depends on whether such support eventually enables each member to formulate and defend an argument rather than remain dependent on stronger speakers. The present case therefore points toward a developmental question about the transfer of responsibility from group support to individual performance.

The written speeches provide a useful counterweight to interview enthusiasm. A participant may feel more confident while still producing a claim that lacks sufficient evidence, or may speak hesitantly while preparing a carefully structured argument. Written products allow the analysis to inspect the organization of a position without equating fluency with cognition. Toulmin's (2003) framework is useful as an analytic lens: a speech can be examined for claims, supporting data, warrants connecting evidence to claims, qualifications, and responses to counterarguments. The source does

not report a standardized Toulmin score, so the framework should guide interpretation rather than create retrospective quantitative results.

Collaborative argument construction is strongest when peers do more than contribute additional points. They can ask what evidence justifies a claim, identify an unsupported assumption, test an alternative explanation, or require the speaker to qualify an overgeneralization. Such dialogue makes reasoning public and revisable. Mercer and Littleton (2007) describe the value of dialogue in which participants give reasons and engage with one another's ideas, while Vygotsky (1978) emphasizes the social mediation of higher mental processes. The debate-community findings are consistent with this view when collaboration involves explanation and revision rather than simple division of speaking roles.

The source identifies critical thinking and problem-solving as dimensions of the community experience. These claims are most defensible when tied to observable debate practices. Critical thinking can be represented by evaluating the relevance of evidence, comparing competing positions, identifying assumptions, and revising a conclusion after challenge. Problem-solving can be represented by deciding how to respond to a counterclaim, how to repair an unclear argument, or how to select evidence under time constraints. A general statement that debate makes students better thinkers would exceed the source evidence; a description of these situated reasoning practices remains well supported.

This construct-sensitive interpretation aligns with UNDIKMA research on critical learning. Permana et al. (2019) linked structured peer interaction with critical-thinking ability in reading, and Hidayatullah and Qomariyah (2023) used a value-line strategy to require learners to take and justify positions in speaking and writing. Hanan et al. (2024) likewise designed tasks that moved learners from comprehension toward analysis, evaluation, and synthesis. Although the skills and settings differ, these studies reinforce a common design principle: cognitive engagement should be built into what learners must do with information, not inferred merely because an activity is collaborative or active.

The debate setting adds a distinctive demand because reasoning must be responsive. A written exercise can allow a learner to complete an argument without confronting an opposing interpretation, whereas debate introduces the possibility that another participant will challenge the evidence or conclusion. The quality of the response matters. Repeating the original claim more loudly does not demonstrate problem-solving; recognizing a limitation, adding relevant evidence, or refining the scope of the claim does. Future observation can record these response types directly, making the cognitive claim more transparent without reducing debate to a single numerical score.

The source's finding of unequal participation is therefore central rather than peripheral. Cognitive opportunities are distributed through speaking turns, preparation roles, and access to peer feedback. If a few experienced members repeatedly formulate the strongest claims, novices may receive social support while still having limited responsibility for reasoning. Gillies (2016) notes that effective cooperative learning requires structuring interaction so that learners are accountable for contribution. In a debate community, role rotation, individual preparation notes, and brief required explanations can make responsibility more visible while preserving the flexibility of authentic discussion.

Equal participation should not be interpreted mechanically as identical speaking time. One member may need longer preparation, another may contribute a concise but important rebuttal, and a third may perform a research role before speaking. The more useful criterion is meaningful access to the intellectual work of debate. Fredricks et al. (2004) distinguish behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement, suggesting why counting turns alone can be misleading. A future record could document who proposes claims, who supplies evidence, who asks for clarification, who responds to challenge, and who revises a position. Such a distribution map would make inclusion more analytically meaningful.

Structured facilitation can address imbalance without turning the community into a teacher-dominated class. A facilitator may ask a quieter member to explain a selected

piece of evidence, require a group to hear an alternative before closing a discussion, or pause a dominant speaker so that another participant can complete a thought. The aim is not to protect learners from challenge but to protect access to challenge. Hattie and Timperley (2007) emphasize feedback that clarifies goals, current performance, and next steps; in debate, facilitation can use the same logic by focusing feedback on the argument rather than on the person's general ability.

This distinction between person and argument is particularly compatible with CLL's humanistic concern. Feedback such as 'your evidence does not yet show why the policy will work' identifies a revisable feature of reasoning, whereas a global judgment such as 'you are bad at debating' threatens identity without offering a next action. The source's reported emotional safety is therefore potentially connected with cognitive engagement when members learn that critique targets ideas that can be improved. Support and rigor become mutually reinforcing: safety makes critique tolerable, and substantive critique gives the supportive community an intellectual purpose.

UNDIKMA speaking research offers useful comparison points. Suadiyatno et al. (2020) found that speaking anxiety was related to speaking performance, and Sugianto, Kamarudin, and Hanan (2020) reported improvement through task-based speaking activities at Universitas Pendidikan Mandalika. These studies concern classroom interventions rather than an ongoing debate community, but they highlight two conditions also visible in the present case: learners need manageable opportunities to use English, and task design influences what kind of speaking practice becomes possible. Debate adds the requirement that the message be defensible in relation to an opposing position.

The community's written speeches also create an opportunity to compare planning with live responsiveness. A prepared text may contain a coherent claim and evidence, but debate requires the participant to adapt when an opponent raises an unexpected objection. The difference between prepared quality and adaptive response can reveal where further support is needed. A member who writes effectively but struggles to answer questions may need interactional language or rapid reasoning practice, while a

fluent responder with weak preparation may need stronger evidence selection. Treating these profiles separately is more informative than assigning a single global label such as strong or weak debater.

The local study of intercultural participation in a debating class by Muliani and Sumarsono (2021) is especially relevant because it involved E2DC debaters and described active exchange of ideas, peer collaboration, and problem-solving. The present case extends that local conversation by examining the community itself and by placing emotional safety alongside argument construction. It does not establish that the same mechanisms operated identically in both studies. Instead, the convergence suggests that debate at UNDIKMA has repeatedly created opportunities for collaborative reasoning, while the current source adds the caution that participation can remain uneven and therefore needs facilitation.

This does not mean that debate motions should always be easy or familiar. Intellectual development also requires encountering unfamiliar perspectives. The design challenge is to distinguish productive challenge from avoidable access barriers. Members can receive background resources or vocabulary support before the debate without receiving the argument they are expected to formulate. This preserves cognitive ownership. The same principle appears in CLL: assistance should make intended communication possible while responsibility increasingly returns to the learner (Curran, 1976; Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

The source's motivation theme can be interpreted in a similarly specific manner. Members may be motivated because they value competition, friendship, English practice, intellectual challenge, or a sense of belonging. A general report of motivation does not identify which of these mechanisms matters most. The study therefore supports describing motivation as part of the community experience rather than assigning one causal explanation. Sumarsono and Permana (2023) found that individualized learning arrangements can support autonomy and positive perceptions when feedback and learner responsibility are built into the process. The debate case

suggests a complementary possibility: responsibility can also be distributed socially while still moving toward individual autonomy.

Written and oral evidence should also be interpreted with attention to language proficiency. A participant may have a sophisticated idea but lack the vocabulary or syntactic resources needed to express it quickly. Conversely, a fluent speaker may rely on rhetorical confidence without adequate evidence. Setianingsih et al. (2024) show why self-belief and speaking performance can be related, but the present study needs an additional distinction between speaking quality and argumentative quality. A future analytic rubric could retain separate dimensions for comprehensibility, organization, evidence, response to counterargument, and revision. This would allow language and cognition to be discussed together without collapsing them into one score.

The four observed meetings provide useful situated evidence but limit claims about development over time. A participant may perform differently depending on the motion, preparation time, partner, assigned role, or personal familiarity with the topic. Longitudinal observation across a semester would make it possible to identify trajectories such as moving from assisted claims to independent rebuttals or from passive agreement to evidence-based challenge. The present article does not infer those trajectories from four meetings. It treats the documented period as a bounded window into community practice.

A stronger future design could combine the source's qualitative strengths with repeated performance evidence. Before a meeting, each member might prepare a short written position. During debate, observations could record challenges and responses. Afterward, participants could revise the position and explain which evidence or counterargument prompted the change. This sequence would preserve authentic debate while generating a visible record of cognitive movement. It would also allow interview accounts of confidence or motivation to be compared with concrete changes in reasoning rather than treated as equivalent evidence.

Unfamiliar motions would be particularly useful for examining transfer. A member may become highly effective when debating topics repeatedly practiced within the

community while struggling to organize evidence on a new issue. Transfer can be investigated by retaining the same argumentative demands while changing the content. If the participant still identifies assumptions, selects relevant evidence, and responds to counterclaims, the case for a more general reasoning resource becomes stronger. The source study does not provide this test, so transfer remains a future research question rather than an established outcome.

The source's use of multiple data types is nevertheless a strength when interpreted carefully. Interviews reveal how participants understand support and challenge; observations show how opportunities are organized; and written speeches display selected outcomes of preparation. Braun and Clarke (2006, 2019) emphasize that qualitative interpretation should remain reflexive and transparent about the analyst's role, while Miles et al. (2014) stress the value of systematic condensation and display. For the present case, the most credible synthesis is one that preserves differences among sources instead of forcing them into a uniformly positive narrative.

A specific example is the relation between confidence and argument development. If a participant reports feeling more confident, speaks more often, and submits a speech with clearer evidence, the three sources converge on a plausible positive development. If confidence rises but the speech remains weakly supported, the result is not a failure of triangulation; it indicates that affective and cognitive development may proceed differently. Similarly, a participant who speaks little but produces careful written reasoning may require interactional support rather than more general critical-thinking instruction. These contrasting profiles are educationally valuable because they guide targeted facilitation.

For English teacher education, the case has a further implication. Debate-community members are not only practicing English; they are experiencing ways of organizing collaborative learning. They can reflect on which questions stimulate reasoning, which feedback invites revision, and which group structures exclude quieter learners. Hanan et al. (2024) and Hidayatullah and Qomariyah (2023) show that critical-thinking goals can be embedded in task design. The debate community can similarly

become a site for pedagogical reflection when members examine how task structure shapes participation and argument quality. This is an educational implication of the case, not a teacher-development outcome directly measured by the thesis.

The article therefore supports a cautious but substantive conclusion about CLL-informed debate. The positive contribution does not lie in proving that one named method caused a general cognitive gain. It lies in showing how supportive relationships, collaborative argument preparation, and repeated debate can create conditions in which reasoning is articulated and challenged. The limitations are equally important: participation was uneven, only four meetings were observed, and no standardized longitudinal measure of cognitive development was used. These boundaries do not diminish the case; they specify the kind of knowledge it provides.

Taken together, the findings suggest that the most productive instructional unit is the sequence of support, contribution, challenge, feedback, and revision. Emotional safety makes contribution feasible; debate makes challenge relevant; feedback focuses attention on improvable features; and revision provides evidence that the learner has responded intellectually rather than merely endured disagreement. This sequence connects CLL's humanistic orientation with the cognitive demands of debate. Future research can test it more explicitly across members and motions while maintaining the qualitative sensitivity that made the present community practices visible.

CONCLUSION

The case identifies emotional safety, confidence, collaborative argument development, critical engagement, and communication within the Executive English Debate Community, while unequal participation remains an important constraint. Interviews, four observed meetings, and written speeches provide complementary but noninterchangeable evidence. The findings support a CLL-informed interpretation in which supportive relationships can enable intellectual risk-taking without removing argumentative challenge. They do not establish an experimentally measured cognitive gain or superiority over other approaches. Facilitators should distribute reasoning

responsibilities deliberately, give argument-focused feedback, and examine independent performance on unfamiliar motions over longer periods.

REFERENCES

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 16(4), 589-597. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2019.1628806

Curran, C. A. (1976). Counseling-learning in second languages. Apple River Press.

Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. Review of Educational Research, 74(1), 59-109. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059

Gillies, R. M. (2016). Cooperative learning: Review of research and practice. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41(3), 39-54. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n3.3

Haerazi, H., Utama, I. M. P., & Hidayatullah, H. (2020). Mobile applications to improve English writing skills viewed from critical thinking ability for pre-service teachers. International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies, 14(7), 58-72. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v14i07.11900

Hanan, A., Terasne, T., & Permana, D. (2024). Developing task-based reading materials to improve EFL students' critical thinking in the extensive reading class. Riwayat: Educational Journal of History and Humanities, 7(4), 2570-2588. https://doi.org/10.24815/jr.v7i4.41364

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 81-112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Hidayatullah, H., & Qomariyah, S. S. (2023). Toward EFL students' critical thinking: How effective Value Line Learning strategy is? Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching), 10(1), 114-119. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v10i1.7854

La Forge, P. G. (1983). Counseling and culture in second language acquisition. Pergamon Press.

MacIntyre, P. D., Clement, R., Dornyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. The Modern Language Journal, 82(4), 545-562. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb05543.x

Mercer, N., & Littleton, K. (2007). Dialogue and the development of children's thinking: A sociocultural approach. Routledge.

Milanrianto, B. A., Permana, D., & Ariani, S. (2023). Cognitive and social strategies to deal with anxiety in speaking: Typical strategies and application. JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 11(3), 502-514. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v11i3.8441

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (3rd ed.). SAGE.

Muliani, M., & Sumarsono, D. (2021). Intercultural communicative competence: L2 learners' participation on debating class. Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching), 8(2), 198-206. https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v8i2.4528

Permana, D., Suadiyatno, T., & Harmawati, S. (2019). Note-Taking Pairs strategy towards students' critical thinking ability in reading comprehension. Jurnal Kependidikan, 5(2), 75-83. https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v5i2.1797

Prayati, Z., Haerazi, H., Irawan, L. A., & Vikasari, R. M. (2020). Developing culture-based English instructional materials to improve students' thinking, ELT achievement, and classroom interaction. Lingua Cultura, 14(2), 211-218. https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v14i2.6650

Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). Approaches and methods in language teaching (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Setianingsih, T., Nafisah, B. Z., Sumarni, B., & Kamarudin, K. (2024). Investigating EFL students' speaking skills viewed from self-efficacy: Instructional experiences learned from senior high schools. Journal of Language and Literature Studies, 4(4), 883-894. https://doi.org/10.36312/jolls.v4i4.2249

Suadiyatno, T., Firman, E., Hanan, A., & Sumarsono, D. (2020). Examining the effect of contextual teaching-learning and anxiety towards students' speaking skills. JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 8(1), 100-107. https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v8i1.2266

Sugianto, S., Kamarudin, K., & Hanan, A. (2020). Improving students' speaking skill through task based language teaching at Mandalika University of Education. JUPE: Jurnal Pendidikan Mandala, 5(6), 56-61. https://doi.org/10.58258/jupe.v5i6.1615

Sumarsono, D., & Permana, D. (2023). Contract learning as individualized instructional strategies in improving students' performance in academic writing courses. JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching, 11(1). https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v11i1.6683

Toulmin, S. E. (2003). The uses of argument (Updated ed.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1958)

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.

Yin, R. K. (2018). Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.). SAGE.

Zein, S., Sukyadi, D., Hamied, F. A., & Lengkanawati, N. S. (2020). English language education in Indonesia: A review of research (2011-2019). Language Teaching, 53(4), 491-523. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444820000208